

on the phone and ask permission and wait for him to deny it or grant it?

Madam Speaker, the first amendment of the Constitution is very simple. It says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. But there is a second phrase: or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. We have a Nation with a long religious history. Contrary to France whose Constitution states that it is a secular republic, in France religion and government never meet.

We are not that way. Congress starts with a prayer. We have In God We Trust above the flag. We have Moses in the back. The Supreme Court has the Ten Commandments above it in its Chambers.

The Supreme Court's ruling is confusing and defies predictability. The Supreme Court has created a hostility towards religion. The Supreme Court has become a court of confusion.

FUTURE CONGRESSES WILL ASK

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the President will address the Nation tonight on Iraq.

At some point in the future, Members of a future Congress will look back at the war in Iraq and ask how we could have let it happen. They will ask why did our leaders try hard to convince the American people that Iraq had something to do with 9/11 when it did not. They will ask why did our government use awesome destructive power against the people of Iraq who posed no imminent threat to our Nation, and did not attack us.

They will ask how our leaders were able to convince us to stay in Iraq for so many years at the cost of so many lives. They will ask why there was no discussion about the countless deaths of innocent Iraqi civilians. They will ask why our leaders talked us into spending money for an unnecessary war when so many real needs for education and health care were unmet. They will ask how did we let fear so penetrate our hearts and our psyches that we forgot who we were, that we forgot our duty to justice, that we forgot our duty to liberty, that we forgot our duty to truth.

GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARDS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 10 Girl Scouts from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia for earning the highly coveted Girl Scout Gold Award.

Through hard work, dedication and perseverance, Kathryn Cook, Kristen Crawford, Aimee Jarvis, Amy Kroeger,

Tera Lekan, Elizabeth Roddy, Brittany Scott, Michelle Teplis, Kelly Watson, and Jordan Wynn, with their community service projects, have positively affected, literally, the world.

Collecting school supplies to donate to young Iraqi students, sewing and stuffing 250 teddy bears for pediatric and emergency ward patients, collecting and donating essentials to foster care children, and writing books for children in both English and Spanish. These are just some of the many projects taken on by these girls.

The Girl Scout program is based on four fundamental goals that encourage girls to develop to their full potential, relate to others with increasing understanding, skill and respect, develop a meaningful set of values to guide their actions and contribute to the improvement of society.

Congratulations to each of these young American girls for their accomplishments and for embracing worthy principles. We look forward to their continued excellent example and for their future leadership.

NO SECURITY IN PRIVATIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give voice to the youth of my district. I recently had a Social Security e-town hall where young adults joined me online to discuss this important issue.

Billy, a constituent of mine from Long Beach, is currently a student at the University of Southern California. He questioned the wisdom and the solvency of the President's plan. He specifically asked me what would the worst case scenario consequences of the President's plan be.

My answer to him was simple. It is clear that Republicans have no desire to strengthen Social Security for future generations.

□ 1015

Instead, their only intention is to privatize this guaranteed retirement program.

Privatization is a first step on the road to the worst case scenario. Privatization proposals hurt everyone, including today's beneficiaries. But it especially hurts young workers who end up paying for the administrative costs of privatization on the front end and then end up paying for it twice with large benefit cuts on the back end. Privatization does absolutely nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security.

If we really wanted to save Social Security, let us work to ensure its solvency. Let us not dismantle guaranteed benefits, especially for young workers like Billy.

EMINENT DOMAIN DECISION

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today against this recent Supreme Court decision in *Kelo v. New London*, which grossly misrepresents the intent and historical precedent regarding government taking of private property. Our Founding Fathers intended to protect private property by limiting government authority.

One would expect that private property taken by eminent domain would become land available for public use such as parks and roads. Unfortunately, this decision creates a loophole for government to manipulate the definition of public use simply to generate greater tax revenue.

Protection of private property is a fundamental right protected in a strong democracy. The Supreme Court's ruling is an insult to all Americans who have worked hard to have a home to call their own. It is a ruling that encourages the strong to take from the weak and flies in the face of what government is intended to do, that is, to protect the lives and property of all American citizens.

THE REPUBLICANS' SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, every working day, every salary and wage-earning American will pay 6.2 percent, or 12.4 if they are self-employed, of their salary to Social Security, that is, up to the first \$90,000. That is creating a \$168 billion surplus, which is being borrowed and spent by this administration, some of it to give tax breaks to the wealthiest among us.

Now the Republicans have a new plan. Here is what Congressional Quarterly says: "The House version essentially counts the Social Security surplus twice. First, the government would borrow the surplus from Social Security's trust funds in exchange for special Treasury bonds, as it does now. It would then direct the surplus into individual accounts, but then borrow it back again in exchange for more bonds. But only the debt to the individual accounts would appear in the government's budget; the debt to Social Security's trust funds would remain 'off budget,' as is now. The surplus itself would be spent as part of the regular budget."

Huh? That is the solution to the problems of Social Security? That is making the future retirement of Americans more secure? That is dealing with the fact that you are stealing money from working people and giving it to people who invest for a living? Give me a break.